

10/743,637MS306415.01/MSFTP513USREMARKS

Claims 1, 3-31 and 33-40 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. A version of the claims is at pages 2-9. Claims 2 and 32 have been cancelled and independent claims 1, 17, 21, 26 and 37-39 have been amended herein to incorporate limitations previously recited in cancelled claim 32. Additionally, claims 3, 4, 14, 28, and 33 have been amended herein to correct minor informalities. Entrance of these amendments is respectfully requested, as such amendments do not necessitate a new search, do not require undue effort on the part of the Examiner, and are provided to further prosecution.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, 13, 37 and 38 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 13, 37 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Caid *et al.* (US 5,794,178) further in view of Cudd *et al.* (US 2004/0105127 A1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reason. Neither Caid *et al.* nor Cudd *et al.* teach or suggest all the elements as recited in the subject claims.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, *the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations*. See MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must be found in the prior art and not based on the Applicant's disclosure. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The claimed invention discloses a system and method to facilitate printing of web pages by employing smart techniques to allow a user to obtain a formatted version of desired content. In particular, amended independent claims 1, 37 and 38 recite a system that facilitates online

10/743,637MS306415.01/MSFTP513US

printing for a web user comprising an analysis component that analyzes data corresponding to a plurality of web pages, the plurality of web pages comprising at least a current web page, to facilitate identifying at least one section of the current web page; a parsing component that dissects the current web page to remove at least one identifiable section from printable view, the at least one section being non-essential to defining content of the current web page; and a *preview component that visualizes a preview version of a printable page for the web user and comprises a thumbnail reference an image of the current web page in its original state.* Caid *et al.* and Cudd *et al.*, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest these claimed aspects.

Caid *et al.* relates to converting a user's query into a context vector to achieve more efficient searching methods for a large amount of machine-readable documents, while Cudd *et al.* teaches a method for forming a printable representation of web pages by employing HTML frames. The combination of Caid, *et al.* and Cudd, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest aspects of now cancelled claim 32 (the limitations of which have been incorporated into independent claims 1, 37 and 38). To make up for the deficiencies of these references, the Examiner erroneously contends that Brown *et al.* (US 6,356,908) teaches *adding a thumbnail reference to the preview version comprising an image of the at least one current web page in its original state.* In contrast to this assertion, Brown *et al.* discloses a method for presenting content from a page in a distributed database. In particular, Brown *et al.* provides thumbnail images adjacent to corresponding links to separate locations in an associated database. Thus, Brown *et al.* does not provide a thumbnail image of a *current web page* prior to any type of user-defined modification as in the claimed invention. As an example to further illustrate this distinction, the claimed invention provides a thumbnail reference to the unmodified version of the web page that has been subsequently modified to exclude non-essential material deemed not desirable to a user. Hence, by *adding a thumbnail reference to the preview version comprising an image of the at least one current web page in its original state,* the claimed invention provides a thumbnail of the *same* web page prior to modification rather than *links to disparate web pages* as is taught by Brown *et al.* As a consequence, Brown *et al.* is silent regarding *adding a thumbnail reference to the preview version comprising an image of the at least one current web page in its original state.*

10/743,637

MS306415.01/MSFTPS13US

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Caid *et al.* and Cudd *et al.* (and Brown, *et al.*), either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the subject claims. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

**II. Rejection of Claim 3 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Caid *et al.*, further in view of Cudd *et al.* and further in view of Foster *et al.* (US 5,404,442). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reasons. The subject claim depends from claim 1, which has been amended to incorporate elements of claim 32, rendering this rejection moot. Thus it is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn.

**III. Rejection of Claims 5-9, 12 and 14-20 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 5-9, 12 and 14-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Caid *et al.*, further in view of Cudd *et al.* and further in view of O'Brien *et al.* (US 2004/0139169). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reason.

Claims 5-9, 12 and 14-16 depend from independent claim 1 and claims 18-20 depend from independent claim 17. Independent claim 17 recites similar aspects as claim 1. In particular, and as discussed *supra* with respect to claim 1, Caid *et al.* and Cudd *et al.* (and Brown, *et al.*) are silent with respect to *a preview component that visualizes a preview version of a printable page for the web user and comprises a thumbnail reference an image of the current web page in its original state*. O'Brien *et al.* does not make up for the deficiencies of these references. O'Brien *et al.* teaches identifying web fragments corresponding to portions of a web site and incorporating them into a destination web site. A user manually determines whether to add selected web fragment. O'Brien does not teach an artificial intelligence (AI) component that performs a utility-based analysis in connection with analyzed data to automatically generate the preview version based at least in part upon user preferences, *the preview version further comprising a thumbnail reference of an image of the current web page in its original state*, as afforded by the claimed invention. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

10/743,637

MS306415.01/MSFTP513US**IV. Rejection of Claims 10 and 11 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Caid *et al.*, further in view of Cudd *et al.* and further in view of Chakrabarti *et al.* (US 6,418,433). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reasons. Chakrabarti *et al.* does not make up for the deficiencies of Caid *et al.* and Cudd *et al.* (and Brown, *et al.*) with respect to independent claim 1 (from which claims 10 and 11 depend). Thus, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

**V. Rejection of Claims 21, 22, 25, 26 and 28-31 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 21, 22, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Manber *et al.* (US 6,920,609) further in view of Caid *et al.* Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reason. Neither Manber *et al.* nor Caid *et al.* teach or suggest all aspects of the subject claims.

Amended independent claims 21 and 26 recite similar limitations, namely *appending a thumbnail reference to a preview version of the user-defined printable page comprising an image of the at least one current web page in its original state*. Manber *et al.* teaches a system for analyzing HTML formatted web pages to automatically identify and extract desired information. As conceded by the Examiner on Page 16 of the Final Office Action with respect to claim 32 (the limitations of which have now been incorporated into independent claims 21 and 26), Manber *et al.* is silent with respect to a thumbnail reference to a preview version of a preview version comprising an image of a the current web page in its original state. Moreover, as discussed *supra*, Caid *et al.* fails to teach or suggest such a feature of the claimed invention. Additionally, as described in detail above, Brown, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest *appending a thumbnail reference to a preview version of the user-defined printable page comprising an image of the at least one current web page in its original state*. Therefore, the combination of Manber *et al.* and Caid *et al.* (and Brown, *et al.*) fails to render the subject claims obvious. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

**VI. Rejection of Claims 23, 30, 39 and 40 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 23, 30, 39 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Manber *et al.* further in view of Caid *et al.* and further in view of Cudd *et al.* It is

10/743,637

MS306415.01/MSFTP513US

respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reason. Manber *et al.*, Caid *et al.* and Cudd *et al.*, (and Brown *et al.*) individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the subject claims.

The subject claims respectively depend from independent claims 21, 26 and 39. Independent claim 39 recites *means for adding a thumbnail of an original version of the user-defined printable page in its original state*. Cudd *et al.*, like Manber *et al.* and Caid *et al.* (and Brown, *et al.*) fails to teach or suggest such claimed aspects. Thus it is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn.

#### **VII. Rejection of Claim 24 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Manber *et al.* further in view of Caid, *et al.* and further in view of O'Brien, *et al.* Claim 24 depends from independent claim 21. As discussed *supra* with respect to claim 21, Manber *et al.* and Caid *et al.* fail to teach all limitations of the subject claim. O'Brien *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies. Accordingly this rejection should be withdrawn.

#### **VIII. Rejection of Claim 27 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Manber *et al.* further in view of Caid *et al.*, and further in view of Foster *et al.* Claim 27 depends from independent claim 26, and as discussed *supra* with respect to claim 26, Manber *et al.* and Caid *et al.* fail to teach all aspects of the subject claim. Foster *et al.* fails to compensate for these deficiencies of Manber *et al.* and Caid *et al.* with regard to independent claim 26, and accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

#### **IX. Rejection of Claims 32-36 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 32-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Manber *et al.* further in view of Caid *et al.*, and further in view of Brown *et al.* (US 6,356,908). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reasons.

As noted *supra*, dependent claim 32 has been cancelled and the limitations previously recited in claim 32 have been incorporated into independent claims 1, 17, 21, 26 and 37-39. Therefore, this rejection is believed to be moot and should be withdrawn with respect to

10/743,637MS306415.01/MSFTP513US

cancelled claim 32 and claim 33 (which depend from independent claim 26).

Independent claim 34 recites *a print preview page of a web page comprising at least a subset of content parsed from a web page and at least one of the following: a thumbnail reference of the web page prior to being parsed and a summary of the web page*. The Examiner asserts that Figure 8 of Brown *et al.* teaches the claimed feature of *a thumbnail reference of the web page prior to being parsed and a summary of the web page*. However, as previously discussed, Brown *et al.* does not provide a thumbnail reference of a web page prior to being parsed, but rather provides thumbnail images of separate web sites adjacent to hyperlinks to those separate web sites. Moreover, Figure 8 of Brown *et al.* teaches various display methods for the thumbnails for the links to separate locations in a database without contemplating providing *a summary of a parsed web page* as afforded by independent claim 34.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that the cited references fail to teach or suggest all aspects of the subject claims. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

10/743,637MS306415.01/MSFTP513USCONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP513US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



Himanshu S. Amin  
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP  
24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731